# Effects of three-body collisions in a two-mode Bose-Einstein condensate

Carlos Sabín,[1] Pablo Barberis-Blostein,[2] Cristopher Hernández,[3] Robert B. Mann,[4,5] and Ivette Fuentes[1]

[1)] *School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD United Kingdom*

[2)] *Instituto de Investigaciones en Matematicas Applicadas y Sistemas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*

[3)] *Instituto de Física, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*

[4)] *Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline St N, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 2Y5, Canada*

[5)] *Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, Canada*

(Dated: 26 November 2015)

We study the effects of three-body collisions in the physical properties of a two-mode Bose-Einstein condensate. The model introduced here includes two-body and three-body elastic and mode-exchange collisions and can be solved analytically. We will use this fact to show that three-body interactions can produce drastic changes in the probability distribution of the ground state and the dynamics of the relative population. In particular, we find that three-body interactions under certain circumstances may inhibit the collapse of the relative population.

arXiv:1407.3365v2 [quant-ph] 25 Nov 2015

## I. INTRODUCTION

Most of our understanding of condensed matter is based on models which consider two-body collisions. However, there are many situations where three-body or higher order collisions are relevant in the physical properties of such systems[1–3]. For example, it is known that three-body collisions are important in systems that show exotic quantum phases, such as topological phases[2] or spin liquids[3]. Moreover, it is suspected that many-body collisions are important in the coldest phases of Bose-Einstein condensates, where the dilute regime breaks down[4]. Microscopic calculations show that polar molecules driven by microwave fields undergo three-body interactions[5]. The interaction potentials of molecules trapped in an optical lattice give rise to Hubbard models with strong nearest-neighbour two-body and three-body interactions.

In this letter we find the exact analytical solution of a generalized two-mode Bose-Hubbard model which includes two-body and three-body elastic and mode-exchange collisions. Then we show that three-body collisions can change dramatically the properties of the ground state of a two-mode Bose-Einstein condensate. The effects are also observable in the evolution of the relative population inhibiting, in some cases, quantum collapse. It is well known that three-body collisions are responsible for particle loss in Bose-Einstein condensates, through a process called three-body recombination[6]. During three-body collisions the particles recombine to form a molecule which is not trapped by the potential. However, it is now possible to inhibit molecular three-body recombination in atomic Bose-Einstein condensates via the application of resonant $2\pi$ laser pulses[7]. In such situations our model becomes of special interest, since it takes into account three-body collisions where particles do not recombine and remain trapped in the potential.

The model we introduce can describe the physics of a double-well Bose-Einstein condensate or a spin-1/2 Bose-Einstein condensate consisting of particles with two internal degrees of freedom trapped in a single well. In the context of the double-well Bose-Einstein condensate, the mode-exchange collisions included here are known as generalized nearest neighbour interactions[8] and give rise to coherent tunneling effects[9,10]. Recent analysis show that stronger two-body interactions are correlated with two-body coherent tunneling dynamics in which two particles simultaneously tunnel through the barrier[10]. This effect, also known as second order tunneling, has been observed in the laboratory[9]. Mode-exchange




FIG. 1. A Bose-Einstein condensate in an asymmetric double-well potential, characterised by the single well energies $\lambda_{a|a}$ and $\lambda_{b|b}$.

collisions are called inelastic collisions in the context of spin-1/2 condensates and occur when cold collisions take place in the presence of light fields. Such is the case of spin-1/2 condensates where a laser field is used to induce Josephson-type interactions, which produce transitions among the spin degrees of freedom[11].

## II. MODEL

We consider a general model of a two-mode Bose-Einstein condensate that includes two-body and three-body collisions given by the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3 = H_1 + H_2 + H_3$ where (taking $\hbar = 1$):

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_1 &= \lambda_{a|a} a^\dagger a + \lambda_{b|b} b^\dagger b + \lambda_{a|b}(a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a), \\
H_2 &= \mathcal{U}_{aa|aa} a^\dagger a^\dagger aa + \mathcal{U}_{bb|bb} b^\dagger b^\dagger bb + \mathcal{U}_{ab|ab} a^\dagger b^\dagger ab \\
&\quad + U_{aa|ab}(a^\dagger a^\dagger ab + h.c.) + U_{bb|ab}(b^\dagger b^\dagger ab + h.c.) \\
&\quad + U_{aa|bb}(a^\dagger a^\dagger bb + h.c.), \\
H_3 &= \mathcal{U}_{aaa|aaa} a^\dagger a^\dagger a^\dagger aaa + \mathcal{U}_{bbb|bbb} b^\dagger b^\dagger b^\dagger bbb \\
&\quad \mathcal{U}_{aab|aab} a^\dagger a^\dagger b^\dagger aab + \mathcal{U}_{abb|abb} a^\dagger b^\dagger b^\dagger abb \\
&\quad + U_{aaa|aab}\,(a^\dagger a^\dagger a^\dagger aab + h.c.) \\
&\quad + U_{bbb|abb}\,(b^\dagger b^\dagger b^\dagger abb + h.c.) \\
&\quad + U_{aaa|abb}\,(a^\dagger a^\dagger a^\dagger abb + h.c.)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+ U_{bbb|aab}(b^\dagger b^\dagger b^\dagger aab + h.c.)$$
$$+ U_{aab|abb}(a^\dagger a^\dagger b^\dagger abb + h.c.)$$
$$+ U_{aaa|bbb}(a^\dagger a^\dagger a^\dagger bbb + h.c.). \quad (1)$$

The operators $a^\dagger, a$ and $b^\dagger, b$ are associated with two modes, labeled A and B, with respective frequencies $\lambda_{a|a}$ and $\lambda_{b|b}$. These modes correspond either to atoms with two different hyperfine levels[12], or two spatially separated condensates[13] (see Fig.(1)). The Josephson-type interaction, in which one particle is annihilated in one mode and created in the other, has coupling constant $\lambda_{a|b}$. This process is induced by applying a magnetic field gradient[13] or a laser[12]. The terms in $H_2$, which have four bosonic operators, describe two-particle collisions. The two-body elastic scattering strengths are given by $\mathcal{U}_{aa|aa}$ and $U_{bb|bb}$ for same mode collisions and $U_{ab|ab}$ when the particles colliding belong to different modes. Mode-exchange collisions have interaction strengths $U_{aa|ab}, U_{bb|ab}$ when two particles collide and one of them is transformed into the other mode and interaction strength $U_{aa|bb}$ when the collision transforms two particles in one mode into the other mode. This process is also know as second order tunneling in the context of a double-well BEC[9,10].

The Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_2 = H_1 + H_2$ has been studied in detail in[15]. This two-body interaction Hamiltonian coincides with the two-mode Bose-Hubbard model if mode-exchange collisions are neglected. i.e. $U_{aa|ab} = U_{bb|ab} = U_{aa|bb} = 0$. However, microscopical calculations show that such interactions, known as inelastic collisions in the context of spin-1/2 Bose-Einstein condensates, should be considered since they occur when particles collide in the presence of a laser field[11]. Surprisingly, including such collision allows for an exact analytical solution[15–18]. Here we include a three-body collision term given by $H_3$, where three-body interactions consist of products of six operators (three creation and three annihilation). This term includes all possible three-body collisions where $\mathcal{U}_{aaa|aaa}$, $\mathcal{U}_{bbb|bbb}$, $\mathcal{U}_{aab|aab}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{abb|abb}$ correspond to elastic scattering lengths and $\mathcal{U}_{aaa|aab}$, $\mathcal{U}_{aaa|abb}$, $\mathcal{U}_{aaa|bbb}$ correspond to mode-exchange collisions where one, two and three particles change mode, respectively.

We have found that the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ has six families of exact analytical solutions. In this paper we present the solution which we consider of greatest physical interest. The other solutions will be presented elsewhere.

We start by considering the double-well potential shown in Fig.(1). Particles undergo two- and three- body collisions and we assume that first, second and third order tunneling

events can occur. In second (third) order tunneling two (three) tunneling events can occur coherently. Therefore single particles can coherently tunnel two (three) times and two (three) particles can tunnel simultaneously during a collision.

We consider that a particle in well A (or B) has probability amplitude $A_1 \cos\theta$ (or $-A_1 \cos\theta$) of staying in well A (or B) and probability amplitude $A_1 \sin\theta$ of tunneling to well B (or A). $A_1$ is the first order tunneling strength and $\theta$ is the tunneling phase. Note that the minus sign appears because we chose for simplicity well B to have negative energy corresponding to $\lambda_{b|b} = -\lambda_{a|a}$. We consider $A_2$ and $A_3$ to be second and third order tunneling strengths. Therefore $A_2 \sin^2\theta$ and $A_3 \sin^2\theta \cos\theta$ for example, are the second and third order probability amplitudes respectively, for a single particle in well A to tunnel back and forth.

The coefficients in the single particle Hamiltonian $H_1$ are found by considering all possible single particle events including second and third order tunneling. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{a|a} &= A_1 \cos\theta + A_2(\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta) \\ &+ A_3 \cos\theta(\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta) = A_2 + (A_3 + A_1)\cos\theta, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

is the probability amplitude for a single particle in well A to end in well A. The general two-body and three-body scattering lengths $U_{ij|lm}$ and $U_{ijk|lmn}$ are given by the product of the corresponding second and third order tunneling strengths times the appropriate tunneling phase amplitudes ($\sin\theta$ if the particle tunnels during the collision and $\pm\cos\theta$ if the particle stays). For example, consider a three-body collision during which two particles change state. The total probability amplitude will be

$$U_{aaa|abb} = 3A_3 \cos\theta \sin^2\theta. \tag{3}$$

The factor 3 comes from the fact that there are three possible events that give rise to the same final outcome, according to the different time ordering of the events.

In the case of two-body collisions we consider that during a collision two and three tunneling events can occur. So collisions in which two particles in well A end up both in well B is given by

$$\begin{aligned} U_{aa|bb} &= A_2 \sin^2\theta \\ &+ 3A_3(\cos\theta \sin^2\theta - \sin^2\theta \cos\theta) = A_2 \sin^2\theta, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where again the factor 3 comes from the time ordering. Such considerations give rise to the parameters,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{a|a} &= A_2 + (A_3 + A_1)\cos\theta, \\
\lambda_{b|b} &= A_2 - (A_3 + A_1)\cos\theta, \\
\lambda_{a|b} &= (A_1 + A_3)\sin\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{aa|aa} &= (A_2\cos\theta + 3A_3)\cos\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{bb|bb} &= (A_2\cos\theta - 3A_3)\cos\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{ab|ab} &= 2A_2(\sin^2\theta - \cos^2\theta), \\
\mathcal{U}_{aa|ab} &= (3A_3 + 2A_2\cos\theta)\sin\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{bb|ab} &= (3A_3 - 2A_2\cos\theta)\sin\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{aa|bb} &= A_2\sin^2\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{bbb|bbb} &= -\mathcal{U}_{aaa|aaa} = -A_3\cos^3\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{abb|abb} &= -\mathcal{U}_{aab|aab} = -A_3(2\cos\theta\sin^2\theta - \cos^3\theta), \\
\mathcal{U}_{aaa|aab} &= \mathcal{U}_{bbb|abb} = 3A_3\cos^2\theta\sin\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{aaa|abb} &= 3A_3\cos\theta\sin^2\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{bbb|aab} &= -3A_3\cos\theta\sin^2\theta, \\
\mathcal{U}_{aab|abb} &= 3A_3(\sin^3\theta - \cos^2\theta\sin\theta), \\
\mathcal{U}_{aaa|bbb} &= A_3\sin^3\theta.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

At this point it is important to illustrate the connection of this model with a physical model of a BEC. Consider the many-body energy functional for bosonic particles of mass $m$ trapped in a potential $V(\mathbf{r})$ undergoing two-body and three-body collisions:

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= H_0 + H_{I2} + H_{I3}, \\
H_0 &= \int d\mathbf{r}\big( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\hat{\Psi}^\dagger\nabla^2\hat{\Psi} + \hat{\Psi}^\dagger V(\mathbf{r})\hat{\Psi}\big), \\
&= \int d\mathbf{r}\hat{\Psi}^\dagger H_t\hat{\Psi}, \\
H_{I2} &= \frac{g_2}{2}\int d\mathbf{r}\hat{\Psi}^\dagger\hat{\Psi}^\dagger\hat{\Psi}\hat{\Psi}, \\
H_{I3} &= \frac{g_3}{2}\int d\mathbf{r}\hat{\Psi}^\dagger\hat{\Psi}^\dagger\hat{\Psi}^\dagger\hat{\Psi}\hat{\Psi}\hat{\Psi},
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $g_2, g_3$ are two-body and three-body coupling strengths respectively and $H_t$ is the Hamiltonian of the trap. The wavefunction $\hat{\Psi}$ can be expanded in terms of a certain set of functions $\phi_i$ and their corresponding annihilation operators $\hat{c}_i$ as

$$\hat{\Psi} = \sum_i \phi_i \hat{c}_i. \tag{7}$$

We employ the standard two-mode approximation

$$\hat{\Psi} = \phi_1 \hat{c}_1 + \phi_2 \hat{c}_2 \tag{8}$$

and then the rotation

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1 &= \cos(\theta/2)\phi_a - \sin(\theta/2)\phi_b \\ \phi_2 &= \cos(\theta/2)\phi_b + \sin(\theta/2)\phi_a, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\phi_a$, $\phi_b$ are nearly-normalized modes[19] with $\int dr \phi_a \phi_a = 1 + \epsilon$, $\int dr \phi_b \phi_b = 1 - \epsilon$, where the amplitude of transition between them

$$\epsilon = \int dr\, \phi_a H_t \phi_b \tag{10}$$

is assumed to be very small. We obtain the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ described above with:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 = \frac{1}{2}(E_1 - E_2);\ A_2 = \frac{1}{2}U_2;\ U_2 = U_{11} = U_{22};\ A_3 = \frac{1}{2}U_3;\ U_3 = U_{111} = U_{222} \\ E_1 = \int dr \phi_1 H_t \phi_1\,,\ U_{11} = \int dr \phi_1^4,\ U_{111} = \int dr \phi_1^6, \\ E_2 = \int dr \phi_2 H_t \phi_2\,,\ U_{22} = \int dr \phi_2^6,\ U_{222} = \int dr \phi_2^6, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

plus several terms of order $\epsilon$, $\epsilon^2$ and $\epsilon^3$ which can be treated perturbatively[17,18] as long as $\epsilon << A_1\theta$. We will discuss the experimental validity of this approximation in the last section.

## III. RESULTS

Surprisingly, the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3 = H_1 + H_2 + H_3$ has an exact analytical solution for this set of parameters. The analytical expression of its eigenstates is:

$$|E_m\rangle = e^{\frac{-\theta}{2}(a^\dagger b - a b^\dagger)} |J, m\rangle, \tag{12}$$

where $|J,m\rangle$ are the Fock states for $2J = N$. $N$ is the total number of particles, given by the operator:

$$\hat{N} = n_a + n_b = a^\dagger a + b^\dagger b, \tag{13}$$

and $m$ is the eigenvalue of the relative population operator:

$$\hat{m} = (a^\dagger a - b^\dagger b)/2. \tag{14}$$

Since the number of particles in the system $N$ is constant, $m$ is restricted to values $m = -J, ..., J$. The unitary operator $e^{\frac{\theta}{2}(a^\dagger b - a b^\dagger)}$ is known as the two-mode displacement operator with real displacement parameter $\theta$.

Interestingly, the eigenstate for $m = -J$ corresponds to a coherent state, which gives an appropriate description of several physical aspects of the two-mode Bose-Einstein condensate[20]. Its easy to verify that $e^{\frac{-\theta}{2}(a^\dagger b - a b^\dagger)}|J,m\rangle$ are the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian (1). One must simply apply the two-mode displacement operator to the Hamiltonian:

$$H_0 = A_1(a^\dagger a - b^\dagger b) + A_2(a^\dagger a - b^\dagger b)^2 + A_3(a^\dagger a - b^\dagger b)^3, \tag{15}$$

which is diagonal in the Fock basis. The result of this transformation is the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_3$ with the coefficients shown in (5), except for an energy shift. For this reason both Hamiltonians have the same energy spectrum and their eigenvectors are related by the displacement operator. The ground state of the system is $|E_g\rangle = e^{\frac{-\theta}{2}(a^\dagger b - a b^\dagger)}|J,m_0\rangle$, where $m_0$ is the integer that minimizes the energy $E_m = A_1 m + A_2 m^2 + A_3 m^3$. This number can be determined with the expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} m_0^\pm &= \frac{A_2}{3\,A_3}\left(-1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \frac{3A_1A_3}{A_2^2}}\right), \; A_3 \neq 0 \\ m_0 &= -\frac{A_1}{2\,A_2}, \qquad\qquad\qquad A_3 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

If $3A_1A_3/A_2^2 > 1$, $m_0$ is a complex number and the energy has no local minimum. Therefore, the minimum energy will correspond to the extreme point $m_{ex} = -NA_3/|A_3|$. On the other hand, if $3A_1A_3/A_2^2 < 1$ then the minimum, which is given by Eq.(16), is $m_0^+$ for $A_3 > 0$ and $m_0^-$ when $A_3 < 0$. However, if the size of the system is big enough then the cubic part of the energy prevails for $|m| >> 0$. Under this circumstances the energy of the extreme point $E_{m_{ex}}$ is smaller than the local minimum $E_{m_0^\pm}$.

A quantity of interest is the probability distribution of the relative population for the ground state, which is given by:

$$P = |\langle N, m|\psi_0\rangle|^2 = |d^N_{m,m_0}|^2 \tag{17}$$

where:

$$d^N_{m,m_0} = \sum_k (-1)^{k-m_0+m} \frac{\sqrt{(N+m_0)!(N-m_0)!(N+m)!(N-m)!}}{(N+m_0-k)!k!(N-k-m)!(k-m_0+m)!} \\ (\cos\tfrac{\theta}{2})^{2N-2k+m_0-m} (\sin\tfrac{\theta}{2})^{2k-m_0+m}. \tag{18}$$

are the Wigner rotation matrix elements[21]. Note that the sum must be done for the values of $k$ such that none of the arguments of the factorials in the denominator are negative. Different ground states parametrized by $m_0$ are obtained by changing the rate $A_1A_3/A_2^2$. We plot in Fig.(2) an example for $N = 100$ particles with $A_3 = 0$ (i.e. assuming there are no third order tunneling and three-body collisions) and $m_0 = A_1/2A_2 = -50$. Such a state has a multi-peak distribution. However, if $A_3 = 0.0035$ we get a single peak distribution corresponding to $m_0 = -100$, i.e. a coherent state. Each figure has an inset with a plot of the corresponding spectrum, where we can see that three body processes generate a shift of the minimum. This shows how three-body collisions and third order tunneling drastically change the structure of the ground state of the system. Moreover, the energy gap between the ground and first excited states is larger in Fig. (2)b). This is a typical feature of the self-trapping regime[22] which suggests that three-body terms tend to favor localization. We will confirm this insight below.

We now analyze the effects of three-body collisions in the evolution of the average relative population $\langle m\rangle = \langle a^\dagger a - b^\dagger b\rangle$, for an initial condition $|\psi(t=0)\rangle$. The evolution of the relative population is given by:

$$\langle m\rangle = \cos\theta \sum_{-N}^{N} m\,|C_m|^2 \\ - \sin\theta \sum_{-N+1}^{N} C_m C_{m-1} \sqrt{N(N+1) - m(m-1)}\, L_m \tag{19}$$

$$L_m = \cos[(E_{m-1} - E_m)\,t] \tag{20}$$

where the coefficients $C_m$ are defined by

$$|\psi(t=0)\rangle = \sum_{m=-N}^{N} C_m e^{\frac{-\theta}{2}(a^\dagger b - a b^\dagger)} |N, m\rangle \tag{21}$$




(a) (b)

FIG. 2. Probability distribution P of the relative population for the ground state with N=100, $A_1/A_2 = 100$ and a) $A_3 = 0$, b) $A_3 = 0.0035$. The ground state distribution changes from a multi-peak to a single peak distribution if three-body collisions are included. The insets show the change in the spectrum.

In Fig. (3) we plot equation (**??**) for $N = 100$, $A_1 = 100$, $A_2 = 1$ and the initial condition $|\psi(t = 0)\rangle = |N, N\rangle$, i.e. all the particles start in a single well. We can see that the relative population shows collapses and revivals for two body collisions. We can also observe that a small rate of three-body collisions ($A_3 = 1/100$) has a noticeable effect on the behaviour of the time evolution of the system, and in fact it tends to breakdown the perfect collapse-revival cycles of the relative population. These cycles are characteristic of a delocalized dynamics, while the small-amplitude oscillations of the population imbalance in Fig. (3)b) point to a self-trapped dynamics. This confirms that the three-body terms tend to favor localization in this model.

## IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

At this point, let us discuss the experimental relevance of our results. In the case of a double-well potential, the modes a and b are quasilocalised modes in wells A and B and $A_1$ corresponds to the asymmetry between the two wells. Thus $\epsilon$ and $A_1$ can be experimentally tuned by changing the distance and the energy offset between the wells, respectively. Indeed, as discussed in[17] the condition $\epsilon << A_1\,\theta$ holds in a wide variety of experiments with double-well BECs[23–25]. More specifically, the linear tunnelling rate $U_{1|2} = \int dr\,\phi_1 H_t \phi_2 \simeq A_1\theta + \epsilon$




(a) (b) (c)

FIG. 3. Evolution of the relative population $\langle m \rangle$ for N=100 particles with $A_1 = 100$, $A_2 = 1$ and $A_3$ specified in each figure. The initial state corresponds to $|\psi(t=0)\rangle = |N, N\rangle$. We observe that the presence of three-body collisions changes the dynamics of the system and in fact tends to breakdown perfect quantum collapse-revival cycles. In c), we show that this phenomenon occurs in a continuous fashion with respect to the parameter $A_3$.

takes experimental values ranging from $5 \cdot 10^{-4} Hz \cdot h$[24] to $2\, Hz \cdot h$[23], while the energy offset between the wells can be as high $A_1 = 530\, Hz \cdot h$[25]. Even if the wells are intended to be perfectly symmetric, the uncertainty in the trap depth leads us to assume a minimum trap asymmetry of $A_1 \simeq 20\, Hz \cdot h$[23]. Regarding the other parameters, $A_2$ and $A_3$ represent the two-body and three-contributions to the potential energy. It has been estimated the latter represent a few percents of the former. For instance, in $He^1$ $A_3$ is around 2 % of the total potential energy. All these values are in line with the plots in the previous section. Note also that the three-body terms represent the leading-order corrections to the standard two-body interaction. It is reasonable to assume that four-body and higher order terms will be small with respect to the three-body ones and overall negligible. We can conclude that our model is suitable to describe a wide variety of experiments involving double-well BECs. It would be interesting to explore as well the microscopic derivation of a spin-1/2 BEC in order to determine the connection with our model.

In summary, we introduce a model of two-mode Bose-Einstein condensate which includes not only two-body but also three-body interactions. We find an analytical solution and provide the full spectrum of eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenvectors. This allows us to analyse the role of three-body interactions in physical quantities of interest, such as the probability distribution of the relative population or the time evolution of its expectation value. We find that three-body collisions have non-trivial effects, such as significant

changes in the probability distribution of the ground state or the inhibition of collapses in the evolution of the relative population of the modes. Our work provides insights on the effects of higher order collisions in the physics of a two component Bose-Einstein condensate. Following the formalism employed in this paper, higher-order collisions can also be included in the model[16].

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I. F. and C.S acknowledge funding from EPSRC (CAF Grant No. EP/G00496X/2 to I. F.) R.B.M. was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## REFERENCES

[1]Murphy R D and Barker J A 1971 Three-Body Interactions in Liquid and Solid Helium *Phys. Rev. A* **3**, 1037.

[2]Cooper N R 2004 Exact Ground States of Rotating Bose Gases Close to a Feshbach Resonance *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 220405.

[3]Balents L Fisher M P A and Girvin S M 2002 Fractionalization in an easy-axis Kagome antiferromagnet *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 224412.

[4]Inguscio M, Stringari S and Wieman C1999 *Bose-Einstein condensation in atomic gases* IOS press.

[5]Bchler H P, Micheli A and Zoller P 2007 Three-body interactions with cold polar molecules *Nature Physics* **3**, 726.

[6]Laburthe Tolra B. et al. 2004 Observation of Reduced Three-Body Recombination in a Correlated 1D Degenerate Bose Gas *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 190401.

[7]Search C P, Zhang W and Meystre P 2004 Inhibiting Three-Body Recombination in Atomic Bose-Einstein Condensates *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 140401.

[8]Heiselberg H 2006 Extended Bose-Hubbard model with incompressible states at fractional numbers *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 013628.

[9]Fölling S. et al. 2007 Direct observation of second-order atom tunnelling *Nature* **448**, 1029.

[10]Liang J -Q, Liu J -L, Li W -D, and Li Z-J 2009 Atom-pair tunneling and quantum phase transition in the strong-interaction regime *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 033617.

[11]Julienne P S 1996 Estimating Bounds on Collisional Relaxation Rates of Spin-Polarized 87Rb Atoms at Ultracold Temperatures *J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol.* **101**, 487.

[12]Myatt C J, Burt E A, Ghrist R W, Cornell E A and Wieman C E 1997 Production of Two Overlapping Bose-Einstein Condensates by Sympathetic Cooling *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 586.

[13]Stenger J et al. 1998 Spin domains in ground-state Bose-Einstein condensates Nature (London) 396, 345.

[14]Miesner H J et al. 1999 Observation of Metastable States in Spinor Bose-Einstein Condensates *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2228.

[15]Barberis-Blostein P and Fuentes-Schuller I 2008 Mode-exchange collisions in an exactly solvable two-mode Bose-Einstein condensate *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 013641.

[16]Barberis-Blostein P and Fuentes-Schuller I 2007 A family of many-body models which are exactly solvable analytically *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40** F601.

[17]Sabín C, Barberis-Blostein P. and Fuentes I. 2014 Analytical solution of a double-well Bose-Einstein Condensate *arXiv e-prints:* 1406.4984.

[18]Mann R B, Young M B and Fuentes-Schuller I 2011 A perturbative approach to inelastic collisions in a Bose-Einstein Condensate *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **44**, 085031.

[19]Milburn, G. J., Corney, J., Wright, E. M. and Walls, D. F., Quantum dynamics of an atomic Bose-Einstein condensate in a double-well potential, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 4318 (1997).

[20]Gordon D. and Savage C M 1999 Creating macroscopic quantum superpositions with Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 4623.

[21]Sakurai J. J. 1994 *Modern quantum mechanics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

[22]Rubeni D., Foerster A., Mattei E. and Roditi I.Quantum phase transitions in Bose-Einstein condensates from a Bethe ansatz perspective, *Nucl. Phys. B 856* 698 (2012).

[23]Albiez M. et al. 2005 Direct Observation of Tunneling and Nonlinear Self-Trapping in a Single Bosonic Josephson Junction, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010402.

[24]Shin Y et al. 2004 Atom Interferometry with Bose-Einstein Condensates in a Double-Well Potential,*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 050405.

[25]Saba M et al. 2005 Light Scattering to Determine the Relative Phase of Two Bose-Einstein Condensates, *Science* **307**, 1945.